

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 42206

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 832
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: November 26, 2014
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
CLAYTON D. DUNCAN,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael E. Wetherell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of sixteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five and one-half years, for trafficking in methamphetamine, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GUTIERREZ, Chief Judge; LANSING, Judge;
and GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Clayton D. Duncan pled guilty to trafficking in methamphetamine. Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(4). The district court sentenced Duncan to a unified term of sixteen years with five and one-half years determinate to run concurrently with any other sentence the defendant was serving. Duncan appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court’s discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-

15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Duncan's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.